

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 23 2006

Regarding: Leslie E. Smith et al.
Serial No. 10/743,936
Filing Date 12/23/2003
For FORMATION OF WIDE PAINT FILM PARTS

Request for Reconsideration of Decision on Petition

Attention: Technology Center 1700
Jacqueline M. Stone, Director

Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:

I certify that this correspondence is facsimile-transmitted
to the Patent and Trademark Office (571 273 8300) on 23 FEB 2006:

Christopher John Rudy: Christopher John Rudy 23 FEB 2006.

Thank you for the DECISION ON PETITION nominally mailed
2-1-06 (postmarked FEB 02 2006) herefor. Please reconsider.

The DECISION ON PETITION is in serious error.

The product required by the language of claims 32-35 is of
drawn or stretched laminated paint film sheet stock, and is wider
than the starting stock. No prior art shows this. Note, the
specification at page 1, lines 18-15, especially lines 24-25:

"[M]any wide products, for example, tonneau covers,
cannot be made with prior paint film technology."

A painted tonneau cover, for example, if made by prior art
would require painting after it was formed. This is a hazard the
present invention avoids. See, the present specification in the
sentence bridging pages 2-3. Such a painted cover would not have
a paint film laminate. Paint is not the same as paint film, and
the articles made with these things thus differ in substance.

Extrusion will not work nor suffice as the Examiners contend.

Every limitation must be considered in article claims 32-35.

The product as claimed cannot be made by another, materially
different process. Thus, MPEP 806.05(f)(B) is not satisfied.

Please, therefore, instruct the Examiners to withdraw the
restriction requirement of claims 32-35 and examine these claims.

Respectfully,

Dated: February 23, 2006 A.D.

Christopher John Rudy
PTO Registration No. 31,873
209 Huron Avenue, Suite 8
Port Huron, Michigan 48060
Telephone (810) 982-4221